

# The Dravidian Problem

K. V. Ramakrishna Rao

The paper “Dravidians – A Literary & Anthropological Study” was presented at 52<sup>nd</sup> session of Indian History Congress, held at New Delhi from February 21-23, 1992. Modified version under the title “Dravidian Problem” was presented at BISS National Conference, Warangal from December 26-27, 1992. Published in the proceedings of the BISS, pp.38-45.

1. **Introduction**: the ethnic interpretation and connotation of Caldwell’s linguistic ‘Dravidian’ has led to the racial hypotheses and theories of ‘Dravidians’. Though the concepts of race and language are two separate entities, the “Dravidians” are still held only in the racial esteem against the so called “Aryans”, in all religious, social and political interactions and processes, even today. Indeed, **Bishop Robert Caldwell (1814 – 1891)** himself has shown the way for such a transition to take place from linguism to racism<sup>1</sup>. In case of ‘Aryans’, it was the study of Sanskrit literature, particularly, the Vedas that played a crucial role in their invention, whereas, comparative linguistic study, but not the study of ancient Tamil literature, popularly known as ‘Sangam literature’, which has resulted in the production of “Dravidians”. When ‘Aryans’ could be found only in the Sanskrit literature, but also in the ancient Tamil literature, ‘Dravidians’ are not at all found in the ancient Tamil literature, but in the Sanskrit literature mostly in the geographical context.

2. **‘Dravidians’ and Tamil literature**: For the purpose of this paper, the forms of Dravid, viz., Dravida, Dravidi, Dravidam, Damila, Dramila, Dravida, dravida and their derivatives are considered. But, surprisingly, none of these words is found in the ‘sangam literature’, generally represented by Pattuppattu, ettutogai and Padinkizhkanakku. Even in Tevaram<sup>2</sup>, only ‘Tamizhan’ was used in the expression, “Seen Aryan, seen Tamizhan”. Only Tayumanavar of 18<sup>th</sup> century uses the word “Dravidam”, that too, to denote the Tamil language<sup>3</sup>. Therefore, it is evident that the forms of ‘dravid’ and their usage by Tamils and Tamil poets were not in vogue upto 18<sup>th</sup> century.

“Nama thipa nikhandu”<sup>4</sup>, a Tamil lexicon assigned to 7, 8 or 11<sup>th</sup> century mentions ‘Dravidam’ as one of the words used for Tamil. “Senthana Divakaram”, another Tamil lexicon of 9<sup>th</sup> century mentions that ‘Dravidam’ as one of the eighteen languages spoken. A later work “Kanthanthu Upadesa Kandam” mentions that Lord Shiva revealed to Agastya the grammar of proud language ‘Dravidam’. The authors of “Prayoga Vivegam” explain that the Sanskrit word “Tramilam” had been changed to “Tamil”, but the modern (Dravidian) scholars refute this strongly and assert that only the word ‘Tamil’ had been pronounced and used as ‘Dravida’ by the Sanskrit scholars. Sivagnana Yogi also mentions that Sanskrit scholars used the word “Dravidam” symbolically to denote “Ten mozhi” (the language of south), that is Tamil<sup>5</sup>. Therefore, it is very clear that Tamils were not only unfamiliar with the usage of the word ‘Dravida’, but also started to denote it for their language only in the modern period, particularly about the advent of the European scholars in south India.

3. **‘Tamil’ in Tamil literature**: there is a well known interpretation that ‘Dravida’ is derived from ‘Tamil’. The word ‘Tamil’ is of course found in the “Sangam” literature at many places. Therein, it is used to denote – 1. Tamil language, 2. Tamil army and 3. Tamil country<sup>6</sup>. The usage of the word ‘Tamil’ is on the increase with the passage of time in the Tamil literature, as is observed from the frequency of its occurrence as follows (see TABLE-A). In Tolkappiyam, it appears five times and in ‘Sangam’ literature 21 times. In the literature of the period 200-500 CE, it is used 45 times, 500-900 CE - 475 times, 900-1200 CE - 381 times and 1200-1900 CE - 341 times<sup>7</sup>. Therefore, when the Tamils know very well about the name of their language and its usage, they need not have derived it from Sanskrit ‘Dravida’ and used such a non-Tamil word to name their ancient language. Moreover, they have been using the word ‘Tamil’ from ‘Sangam’ period to modern times, to denote their ancient language as proper and abstract nouns, but in any case, it has never been used in their racial connotation.

4. **‘Ariyar’ in the Tamil literature**: ‘Ariyar’ have been mentioned several times in the Tamil literature and described sufficiently to know them<sup>8</sup>. Therefore, an important

question arises, “When there were Aruyar, why not Dravidar available at that time?”. The answer is that the Tamils never considered ‘Ariyar’ as outsiders and ‘Dravidar’ themselves. Originally, ‘Ariyar’ or ‘Aryans’ were created by Maxmueller from the Vedic literature, but ‘Dravidians’ from the comparative grammar of the “Dravidian languages”. The anthropologists succeeded in comparing the descriptive physical features of Dasas, Dasyus and Panis, like Varna, Anas, Mridhavachah etc., with their anthropometry. But, ‘Aryans’ were not compared with the description given in the Tamil literature to verify the anthropometric parameters like Cranial index, Nasal index, Stature etc.

5. **Anthropometry of ‘Dravidians’**: Huxley (1871), Haeckel, Turner (1900), G. Oppoert, Risely (1908), E. Thruston (1909), Seligman, Sclater and others have given different and varying anthropometric data and descriptions about ‘Dravidian race’ (Table-B). They have tried to compare them with the Mediterranean, Negrito and Australoid races with the above racial parameters. Their stature / height varies from short to medium, skin / complexion from yellow brown / brown to black; head from mesocephalic to dolicocephalic; nose from broad to narrow and flat to narrow; eye colour from brown to black; hair from straight or wavy to curly but not woolly or frizzy; lips from thick to protruding and so on. If this is the racial picture of ‘Dravidians’, the picture given by the Tamil poets about the ancient Tamils is entirely different.

6. **“Anthropometry” of the ancient Tamils**: the Tamil poets have too meticulously described about head, eyes, hair, lips, ears, eyelids, hands, legs and body structure of the ancient Tamils at many places, but they never painted them with ‘black’ as has been done by the above ‘racist’ scholars. Indeed they have used different terminology for each characteristic e.g, uchi, talai, siram for head; kudimi, mayir, kundal, mudi, ori, alagam, ulai for hair; adi, siradi, sivanta adi, kal for feet; meni, uruvam, udal, agam, sariram, uru for body; euiru, muruval, pal for teeth; nodal, netri for forehead; kavul, tadai, movai for jaw; kannidazh, imai for eyelids; idazh, adaram, udadu for lips, these words are used with suitable adjectives to specify the physical characteristics of men and women. Each word is used appropriately to describe a morphological trait. Indeed, many poets, scholars and other personalities were named after a specific characteristic possessed by them, e.g,

*Asiriyar Perungannan* (the teacher with big eyes), *Perungannan* (a man with bigger eyes), *Ilangannan* (a man with youthful eyes), *Sengannan* (a man with reddish eyes), *Nettimaiyar* (a man with lengthy eye brows), *Naraimudi nettiyar* (a man with white hair and high stature), *Irumbidattalaiyar* (black colour haired headed man or a man with a strong head like a iron), *Sittalai sattanan* ( Sattanan with puss-head), *Peruntalaiyar* (a man with bigger head), *Pullatru eyitranar*), *Kazharkkiran eyitranar* (men with characteristic teeth). The ancient Tamil literature clearly mentions that the skin colour of the ancient Tamils were that of the ‘tender mango leaves’ (*mamai*). The kings had the colour that of Sun. The heroines have been described that they had bright colours body like ‘unsheathed sword’ with reddish hand and feet<sup>9</sup>. Interestingly, Kalittogai stresses that women should have big mons venris, shoulders and eyes and small forehead waist and feet, as such parameters were considered as good characteristics i.e, morphology. Recently, a gold ring dated to c. 2 BCE to 1 CE has been discovered on the banks of Amaravati (formerly Anporunai) Karur in Trichirappalli (District of Tamilnadu). Figures of man and woman have been embossed on the front side of the ring which clearly exhibits the physical features. The man is tall, slim, eyes lengthy, lips medium, nose normal and head dolicephalic. The woman is also tall but shorter than man with the same morphological traits. The gold mouth pieces recovered from Adichanallur are indicators to show that the Tamil lips are in perfect shape with medium size, but not protruding. From these details, one can bring out the morphological characteristics of ancient Tamils, they were never considered as belonging to a particular race or different races.

6.1. Here the important point should be noticed is that though the Indologists have compared and correlated the physical feature described in the Vedas with their ‘Dravidians’, they have not applied the same methodology in comparing and correlating the morphological features of the ‘ancient Tamils’ from ‘Sangam literature’ with the modern antropometric indices. In any case, we do not come across ‘Dravidians’ with black skin, snubbed nosed (anas), impaired speech (mrdhavacah) and other ‘Vedic’ descriptions in Tamil literature.

7. **Inconsistent race theories:** When going through the classification of the races according to different scholars, we are surprised to know how the races and sub-races increase and overlap. According to Linnaeus (1735) there were four races – European, Asiatic, African and American; and according to Blumenback (1781), five – Caucasians, Mongolian, Ethiopian, American and Malay. Huxley recognizes five principal and fourteen secondary races.

Deniker (1900) makes provisions for seventeen groups consisting of twenty five races and sub-races. J. S. Huxley and A. C. Haddon have only three groups white, yellow and black races. This classification definitely exposes the pseudo-scientific character as it looks much more scientific in Greek garb – dolicocephalic, mesocephalic, brachycephalic, leiotrichi, cymotrichi, leucoderms, xanthoderms and so on. And in the case of ‘Dravidians’, too, we have Homo-Dravidians, Proto-Dravidians, Pre-Dravidians, Mongol-Dravidians, Scytho-Dravidians and of course Arya-Dravidians (!) and so on. But, significantly, the ancient Tamils never described and grouped themselves so. But, forgetting all facts, ‘Dravidians’ are viewed characteristically with all exceptions and a great deal of overlapping, as a separate race.

7.1. **Divergent theories about the origin of Dravidians:** About the origins of ‘Dravidians’, Keans, Morris, Sclater, Turner, Ragozin, Caldwell, Perry, Smith, Hornell and Indian scholars including Kanakasabhai have propounded many interesting, but divergent hypotheses and theories based on mythology, philology, anthropometry, and other factors<sup>10</sup>. They can be broadly grouped and explained as follows:

**Central Asian Origins:** From the comparisons of morphological and some linguistic similarities, some scholars considered that Dravidians came from Central Asia. Caldwell delved much on the ‘Scythian’ origins. Here, they coolly forgot the other famous hypotheses / theories that ‘Aryans’ also came from Central Asia. It is really surprising if both “Aryans” and ‘Dravidians’ come from ‘Central Asia’, then why they should have been pitted against each other for all Indian historical processes?

**West Asian Origins:** As the west Asia had several ancient civilizations, it was argued that ‘Dravidians’ must have been originated from one of such civilizations by intermixing or interbreeding.

**Diffusion theory:** Tracing all civilizations to an Egyptian and Mediterranean source, it was argued that ‘Dravidians’ were a branch of Mediterranean race evolved consequent to miscegenation of Mediterranean and West Asian elements.

**North-Indian and Trans-Himalayan Origins:** Before, the advent of ‘Aryans’, ‘Dravidians’ were living in the north including north-eastern and western parts of India. When the ‘Aryans’ started occupying, the Dravidians had to spread towards south. The Trans-Himalayan origins locate ‘Dravidians’ beyond Himalayas like Tibet, from where they entered India from the north east. Here, how the ‘Aryan’ factor has also been taken into consideration to explain the advent of ‘Dravidians’ in India, can easily be noticed. Interestingly, however, no scholar has ever propounded the ‘Dravidian invasion’ hypothesis or theory so far.

**Lemurian or Kumari continent Origins:** To counter the above ‘out of India’ or ‘foreign’ origins, it was argued that ‘Dravidians’ came from the submerged ‘Kumari’ or ‘Lemuria’ continent.

7.2. Of the above, the first three origins heavily depend on Semitic religious literature and the last two on the references mentioned in the “Sangam” literature about the submergence of land masses. But where in the ancient Tamil literature, it is mentioned that they can be from outside the boundaries of Himalayas in the north, Kumari in the south, eastern ocean (Kuna kadal) in the east and Western ocean (Kuda kadal) in the west.

8. **Contradictions of Anthropometry:** The anthropologists turned ‘race science’ with their craniometers, spheroidal hooks and other instruments have tried to create ‘Dravidians’ out of ‘Aryans’ with their inconsistent, divergent measurements of

morphometry and craniometry. They have completely ignored the hereditary and environmental factors like climate, diet, occupation, genes, combination of chromosomes etc., in their 'scientific' study. Now, it has been proven on research work that stature increases with urban life, occupation and of course changes with hereditary. Children differ from parents. Dolicocephalic parents produce brachycephalic children and in turn, such brachycephalics produce mesocephalics. Thus, physical changes occur in all groups under consideration and their extent increases with every child.

8.1. A careful study and analysis of the antropometric tables given by Edgar Thruston reveal such contradictions<sup>11</sup>. We find one brachycephalic among 23 dolicocephalic Kadis; 5 out of 40 Kammalans; 6/50 Pallans; 5/42 Idaiyans; 5/24 Pulayans; 8/40 Madiga; 6/30 Malas; 11/60 Besthas; 10/40 Odee; 12/60 Golla; 14/50 Boya; 12/40 Bant; 16/40 Kapu; 19/50 Kurumba; 23/50 Pamhala; 20/50 Holeya; 28/50 Billava; 27/50 Vakkaliga. Thus, the heads of South India tribes or 'Dravidians' ethnologically and or racially do not conform the views of anthropologists or Vedic and Tamil literature.

8.2. Brahmans are always considered 'Aryans' in the 'Dravidian', context . But, surprisingly such Brahmans themselves do not oblige anthropologists to fit into 'Aryan anthropometry' showing variations. Among 20 dolicocephalic Brahmans, we find one brachycephalic, Pattar Brahmans 2/25; Desastha 4/24; Madhvas – 18 brachycephalics out of 60 mesocephalics; Karnataka Smartha – 9 brachy out of 50 meso; Mandya – 31 brachy out of 50 meso; shivalli – 17 brachy out of 30 meso. Similarly stature and nasal indeces given by him for respective groups do vary considerably. Thus, we find more 'Aryans' among 'Dravidians' and more 'Dravidians' among 'Aryans'. At one stage, the demarcation between 'Aryans' and 'dravidians' ceases. Therefore, it is very clear that these studies are far from the scientific nature.

9. **Origin of Linguistic 'Dravidian' and 'Dravidian race'**: When those 'race scientists' were making attempts to invent 'Dravidians', linguistics were also busy in the same process, but trying to approach differently. Thus, Francis W. Ellis, while comparing the languages Tamil, Kannada, Malayalam and others used the expression 'South Indian

dialects'. A. D. Campbell in his 'A Grammar of Telugu language' (1816) named them as 'The dialects of South India'. Lassen grouped the South Indian languages under the terminology 'Dekhan language'. Hackson through his studies carried out in 1848 and 1856 in the Nilgiris and surrounding places, termed the languages spoken by the people of those areas as 'Tamulian'. For the first time Caldwell called them "Dravidian languages". T. Burrow and M. B. Emeneau, Kamil V. Zvelebil, M. Anthropolov and other modern scholars skillfully used their linguistic studies to confirm the "Dravidian race". They have given more emphasis to the 'Dravidian race' than to the linguistic research, as is evident from their works.

10. **Dravida – Sanskrit sources**: According to Manu<sup>12</sup> 'Dravidas' were the degraded Kshatriyas and said to be the descendants of Dravida, son of Vrishaba. In the two lists of degraded Kshatriyas given in Mahabharat, Dravida are the only South Indian group mentioned. Bhagavata Purana mentions Satyavrata as the 'Lord of Dravida', i.e., King of Dravida, Kanchi. In Saundharya Lahiri, a work assigned to Adi Sankara, the 75<sup>th</sup> verse mentions about 'Dravida sisu'. Chanakya, the great minister of Chandragupta Maurya was mentioned as a native of Dravida i.e., Kanchi. Indeed, he had several names viz., Vatyayana, Mallanga, Kutila, **Dramila**, Paksilasvami, Vishnugupta and Angula, of which, we see 'Dramila' as one of them. Kumarila Bhatta of the 7<sup>th</sup> century uses the expression '*Andhra Dravida Bhasa*'. A *Dramidacharya*<sup>13</sup> has been referred to in Visistadvaita literature (c.7<sup>th</sup> cent). Varahamihira's Brahmat Samhita and Yoga Yatra, Varahapurana, Varahitantra and Mahabharat collectively call the following people as 'Dravidas', viz., the Andhras, Karnatakas, Gurjars, Tailingas and Maharastras. Indeed they were also collectively known as '*Pancha Dravidas*' in contrast to '*Pancha Gaudas*', but to represent Brahmans of India.

The Brahmans of north of Vindhya were called 'Pancha Gaudas', and they are –

1. Sarasvasthas of Kashmir,
2. Kanyakubjas of Punjab,
3. Mukya Gaudas of Bengal,
4. Utkalas of Orissa and
5. Maithilas (with 'Misra' title) of Nepal and Bihar.

Markandeya, Garuda, Vishnu-Darmottara Haha Puranas and Brihat samhita locate 'Dravidas' along with the Kambojas, Strimukhas and Anarttas in the south-west of Bharat. Dasakumara Charitra<sup>14</sup> also mentions that there was a country named 'Dravida' and Kanchi, a city was situated in it. Kadambari<sup>15</sup> calls as inhabitant or native of that country as 'Dravida'. A sage is known as 'Dravida-gaudaka' and a Upanishad 'Davidoupanishad'. Bharata refers to 'Dravida' in his *Natyasastra* and Bana mentions about a 'Dramida marga'. In the rhapsodies of Bilhana 'Vikramaditya's digvijata', the Chola army has been referred to as 'Dravida army' and Chola king as the 'Dravida Lord'. According to Muir and Caldwell, as late as in 1854, the learned Hindu philologist Babu rajendra Lal Misra spoke of 'Dravidi' as one of the recognized Prakrits, equally with the Sauraseni.

11. **Dramila and Dravida – Jain accounts**: Jain works Samvanga Sutra (c.300 BCE) and Pannavanna Sutta (c.168 BCE) mention about the prevalence of eighteen varieties of scripts in the country in the early times and 'Damili' was one of them. To propagate Jainism in Tamilnadu, the Digambara Jain teacher Vajrananti established a 'Dravida Sangha' (in 470 CE) at Madurai. In the Saturngaya Purana, Chap. VII (400 vv) assigned to 421 or 605 CE, it is mentioned "Dravida-valikhilla-charitratrithoddhava", referring to a 'Dravida', the son of Vrisbhasvamin, a Jain<sup>16</sup>. 'Damila' has been mentioned in Hemachandra's Sthaviravali Charitra, but according to Fleet, Dramila was the Dravida country of the Pallavas on the east-coast, and Kanchi was its Capital.

12. **Damila – Buddhist accounts**: Pali chronicle gives detailed accounts of 'Damila'. The Buddhist work Lalitavistara, a work in Sanskrit (c. 2 cent. CE) refers to 64 scripts used at the time of Buddha and they included 'Dravidi lipi'. A Vinaya commentary called 'Vimativinodani' was written by Kassapa Thera, who was an inhabitant of the kingdom of 'Damila'. A careful study of the Buddhist texts shows that 'Damilas' were fighting people always engaged in constant strifes with Sinhalese in Lanka. It is interesting to note that they are described as 'Anarya', the Ceylon chronicles, Mahavamsa and Dipavamsa give more details about 'Damilas' on several occasions. At the same time, it does not clearly say as to who were Damilas or from which part of India, they came over to Ceylon, but

to distinguish between Pandya and Chola divisions of the Tamil country. In Dipavamsa, 'Dramilas' have been mentioned eight times<sup>17</sup>. The commentators of Buddhgosa distinguish the 'Damilas' from Yavanas and Kiratas on the one hand and from the Andhras on the other. The Chinese monk Yuan Chwang who visited the Tamil country in 637 CE mentions in his report that Kanchi (Kan-chih-pulo) was the capital of 'Dravida' (To-lo-pi-la) country. Peutingier table gives that he used Timila, Timir, Cimbo for 'Dravida country'. Parakrama Bahu I (1153-86 CE) had the able services of a Tamil general known as "Damiladhikarin" Rakka.

13. **Dravida, Dramila and Damila in Inscriptions**: An epigraphic study of inscriptions and copper plates of Southern India from ancient times to 18<sup>th</sup> century reveal an interesting fact that the words Dravida, Dramila, Dravida of Sanskrit, Dravida, Dramida, damila of Prakrit and their forms and variations in other South Indian languages including Tamil denote only Tamil language "Tamil" and they are used as nouns and adjectives. At several places, Dravidas or Damilas have been distinguished from other South Indian Kings Cheras, Cholas, Pandyas, Andhras and others. Among the traditional 56 kings and kingdoms, 'Dravida' was always one of them, as mentioned in the inscriptions and copper plates. Therefore, even in their linguistic approach, the South Indian epigraphs have not clubbed Kalingas, Andhras, Karnatakas, Keralas and others with 'Dravidas' or 'Damilas' and also not grouped the Tamilians – Cheras, Cholas and Pandyas under the category. Hence, it is very evident that the term 'Dravida' or 'Damila' was restricted to the Tamil language and Tamils but no racial connotation was attributed to it.

14. **Dravidians of Modern scholars**: From the above, we can how the 'Dravidians' created out of the words Dravida, Dravida, Damila, Dramila and Damila do not tally with the anthropometry and anthropological data. But, in spite of this, there is much rhetoric about 'Dravidian race', 'Dravidian blood', 'Dravidian skull', 'Dravidian bones' and so on. About their origins also, it has already been shown how the 'Dravidian' protagonists propose and propound the theories that they came from Egypt, Central Asia, Mediterranean, Tibet and so on, ignoring tradition, heritage, culture and civilization of

the ancient Tamils. From the geographical description of ancient Tamilagam, five fold division of land and people, names of rivers, mountains, kings, cities and kingdoms, well defined boundaries and socio-cultural norms followed that they did not come from outside or even outside the boundaries enumerated. In fact, there has not been a single instance mentioned in the ancient Tamil literature that Tamils had come from outside of India, north or some other place. Though, Ganges and Yauna have been mentioned, the river Sindhu has not been mentioned. Similarly, Patali (putra) and Ayodhya have been mentioned, but not the cities of Indus valley civilization. This directly proves that the Tamils belonged to Tamilagam, which was part and parcel of Bharat and also they were not driven away to the end of the Bharat by the so called 'Aryans'. Indeed, in 'Sangam' literature, it was never mentioned that they were defeated by 'Aryans' or driven away to the southern end by them, instead, they are many references, which describe how the kings of north were defeated by the Tamil kings and royal symbols of them were inscribed on the Himalayas.

15. **Conclusion:** In the case of 'Aryan race', Max Mueller confessed,

*“I have declared again and again that if I say Aryan, I mean neither blood nor bones,, nor hair, nor skull, I mean simply those who speak an Aryan language.....To me an ethnologist who speaks of Aryan race, Aryan blood, Aryan eyes and hair, as great sinner as a linguist who speaks of a dolicocephalic dictionary or brachycephalic grammar”.*

But, unfortunately, the propounders of “Dravidian race” hypotheses and theories had not repented and confessed about their “invention”, during their life-time. Therefore, they have to resurrect from their graves and confess, “We have declared again and again that if I say Dravidian, we mean neither blood nor bones,, nor hair, nor skull, we mean simply those who speak a Dravidian language.....To us an ethnologist who speaks of Dravidian race, Dravidian blood, Dravidian eyes and hair, as great sinner as a linguist who speaks of a dolicocephalic dictionary or brachycephalic grammar”. But, now-a-days not only politicians but also historians talk and write about such contradictions and concoctions. The westerners' wrong understanding or the ill-motivated study of the word 'Aryan' resulted in the world wars with the genocide of a particular (assumed) race.

When they realized the danger of the ‘Aryan’ and other racial myths, they consigned these theories to dustbins.

15.1. Caldwell’s linguistic invention was given a racial twist by the western and Indian scholars with vested interests. Thus has resulted in the present day Dravidian movements characterized by contempt and hatred for a particular community. The word ‘Dravidian’ was specifically coined on a hypothetical basis to create a race superior to the Aryan race. It was not confusion about the nature of races and their cultures (languages), but a planned conspiracy by the British and their priest-turned historians and other Indologists with political motive to divide Indians. Now, we see that the Indian politicians too adapt and adopt the same methodology to achieve their goals. Those who speak about Aryans and Dravidians should keep in mind one important fact. These people always quote Sanskrit scriptures or non-Dravidian literature to prove the existence of a pre-Aryan Dravidian race in India. But, there is not a single reference in their so called ‘Dravidian literature’ to this effect. Even they did not call themselves by that name, which was invented later, is vouchsafed by their own literature.

15.2. Race and language are two separate entities. Just because a section of people speaks a particular language, it cannot become a distinguishable race. Among the so called ‘Dravidians’, we find tall white dolicocephalics, short dark brachycephalics, intermediate types, half-breeds and a few blonds. So, anthropologically also, a Dravidian cannot be described specifically by stature, nasal index, cranial index, characters. Traits and aptitudes, as they differ in culture and morphology at different places. If the ‘Aryan’ race theory is a myth, as has been accepted by world scholars, the theory of the ‘Dravidian race’ is the greatest myth and this has to be accepted by the Indian scholars in the interest of Indian society, nation and national integration in the historical perspective.

## Notes and References

1. Robert Caldwell, *A Comparative Grammar of the Dravidian or South-Indian Family of Languages*, University of Madras, 1976, pp. 108-120, 636.

2. Tevaram of Tirugnana Sambandar, 6<sup>th</sup> Tirumarai, 23<sup>rd</sup> Padigam, Tirumaraikkadu-6479.  
In another place, he says, “Aryan with chaste Tamil” – 46<sup>th</sup> Padigam, Tirumarakkadu-6710.  
Here, both ‘Aryan’ and ‘Tamizhan’ refer to God Shiva.
3. Siddharkanam.
4. Sivasubramanya Kavirayar, *NamaThipa Nikandu*, Thanjavur University, 1985.
5. Sabapathy Navalar, *Dravida Prakasikai*, Madras, 1899, p.7.
6. Purananuru 50: 9-10; 58: 12-13; Sirupanatrappadai: 66-67; Paripadal 6:60.
7. This clearly proves that the word ‘Tamil’ is ancient than ‘Dravida’ in the linguistic context.
8. K. V. Ramakrishna Rao, Summary published in the *Proceedings of the Indian History Congress*, Calcutta, 1990, p.165  
....., Published in the proceedings of *Seminar on the Aryan Problem*, The Mythic Society and The Bharatriya Itihasa Sankalana Samiti, Bangalore, 1991, pp.215-225.  
....., *The Aryan Problem*, Bharatiya Itihasa Sankalana Samiti, Pune, 1993, pp.75-80.
9. Agananuru – 45, 208, 270, 383. 136: 20-24: When the heroine removed the cloth covered, she appeared bright like the unsheathed sword. Kalittogai: 108-2 and 3 mention the specific morphological traits of the ancient Tamil women.
10. These race theories have been based on many unscientific myths like purity of blood, eugenics etc., In fact, the U. N. has passed resolutions condemning such “racist myths”.
11. Edgar Thruston, *Castes and Tribes of Southern India*, Vol. I, Madras, 1909, pp.lxi-lxxii.
12. Manu. X. 43-44; Muir’s Sanskrit Texts, Vol. I, Bhagavat Purana. IX.i.23 (Pargiter).
13. “The progenitor of Tamuna spoke of a ‘Dravidabhasyakara’ as the great expounder of the Brahmasutra and of ‘Srivatsankamisra’ as a great commentator and as an expounder of Nyaya....‘Dravidabhasyakara’ spoken of by Yamuna superficially appears to be the same Dravidabhasyakara due to the similarity of name. but, we have shown in the pages of the book that he is none other than Shri Satakopa (Nammalvar) who sang the hymns in Tam (Tiruvaimozhi) and who has been extolled by Yamuna in his ‘Stotraratna’ (117-119). Hence, it is that instead

- of saying ‘written by ‘Dravidabhasyakara’, Yamuna says in his ‘Atma Siddhi’, Dramidabhashya krta’. Dramida should ordinarily be referred to an Dramida himself”. Polaham Rama Sastri, **Dravidatreya Darsanam**, Madras, 1957, p.ix.
14. Verse – 130.
  15. Verse – 229.
  16. Indian Antiquary, Vol. 30, 1901, p.250.
  17. Herman Oldenberg (Translator), Dipavamsa, asian Educational Services, New Delhi, 1982, 18-47; 19-16; 20-15; 17, 18, 27, 29, 21-45.
  18. Tolkasppiyam, Eluttadhikaram, Payiram: The Boundaries Tamilagam: Vengada hill in the north, Kumari in the south, Kunakadal in the east and Kudakadal in the west. This description continues consistently throughout the Tamil literature.
  19. Ma Mueller, **Biographies of Words and the Home of Aryans**, London, 1888, p. 120.

TABLE – A

The number of times the word ‘Tamil’ occurs in the Tamil literature			
Period	Work		Total no.
From earlier times to 300 BCE – 300 CE	Tolkappiyam		5
300 BCE	Sangam literature		21
300 – 500 CE	Silappatikaram	24	45
	Manimekhalai	5	
	Tiruvalluvamalai	6	
	Tirumantiram	10	
500 – 900 CE	Appar Tevaram	7	475
	Sambandar	260	
	Sundarar	48	
	Nalayira Divya Prabandam	93	
	Nandi kalambagam	4	
	Pandikkovai	30	
	Perungathai	2	
	Mottollayiram	5	
	Sivaga Chintamani	6	
	Kamba Ramayanam	18	
	Tiruvacagam	1	
	Tirukkovaigar	1	
900 -1200 CE	Kalladam	22	381
	Padinonram Tirumarai	43	
	Periya Puranam	313	
	Ambigapati Kovai	3	
1200 – 1900 CE	Tirumar Kovai	17	341
	Madurai Kovai	25	
	Tanjavur Kovai	9	
	Kulottunga Chozhan Kovai	7	
	Vilibharata	18	
	Kumaragurubarar	105	
	Kurala kuravanchi	10	
	Tamizh vidu thuthu	15	
	Tiruarutpa	24	
	Tituvilanji Murugan Pillaittamizh	35	
	Kulattur Arumuthambigai Pillaittamizh	8	
	Komatiyambigai Pillai Tamizh	5	
<b>TOTAL</b>			<b>1268</b>

Taken from *Tamizh Nulgalil Tamizh Mozhi, Inam, Tamizhnadu*, by P. Krishnan, Ilan Tamzhar Pathiupagam, 28, II Madley Street, I. Nagar, Madras – 600 017.

**TABLE – B**

Anthropological features of Dravidian race as propounded by different scholars

Name of the scholar	Stature / height	Skin / complexion	Head	Nose	Eye color	Hair	Lips	Reference
Sir Herbert Risely	Short or below mean	Very dark, approaching black	Long	Very broad, some times depressed at the root, but not so as to make the face appear flat	Dark	Plentiful, with an occasional tendency to curl	-	The People of India, 1908.
Sir William Turner	Usually low, but shorter than the Australians	Dark approaching		Low nose with wide nostrils	Dark	Black – either straight, wavy or curly but not woolly or frizzly r	Thick	Contributions to the Craniology of the People of the Empire of India, Part – II. The Aborigines of Chota Nagpur and of the cEntral Provinces, the People of Orissa, Veddah and Negritos, 1900.
Huxley	-	Dark skin	Evidently long prognathous skull with well developed brow-ridges	-	Dark	Dark, wavy black hair	-	Anatomy of Vertebrate Animals, 1871.
Haeckel	-	Light or dark brown colour some yellowish brown	Forehead is generally high	Prominent and narrow	-	More or less curly	slightly protruding	History of creation
Mihail Nestrüh	Medium	Brown to black	Long	Slightly slanting, broad	Brown	Wavy thin	Thick	Human Races, Mir Publishers, Moscow, 1974, p.130.
Srinivasa Iyengar	Tall	Brown	Receding forehead	Thick prominent	-	-	-	Tamil Studies (He says that pure Dravidians have hair body, well-propotioned limbs besides noted features), p.15.

**TABLE – C**

**‘Dravidian’ Origins**

<b>Author</b>	<b>Theory</b>	<b>Located place</b>
Keane and Morris	Indo-African-Austral	Submerged continent under the Indian ocean
Sclater	Indo-African-Austral	Entered into India before submergence
William Turner	Employment of certain words and use of boomerang.	Australia
William Turner	Dravidians, the Kolarian speaking languages similar to Mundari.	Entered into India from the north-east
William Turner	Dravidians, the proper language similar to ‘Tamil’	Entered into India from the north-east
Caldwell	Scythians	Entered into India through north-eastern passes
Kanakasabhai	Mongolian (Trans-Himalayan) – philological comparisons	Tibet
Several ethnologists	Cacasian stock	Central Asia
Z. A. Ragozin	Elamite	Middle east
W. J. Perry	Diffusion theory. Migrated into India at a remote date from their original home.	Egyptian and Mediterranean.
Grafton Elliot Smith	Mixing of old and pre-Dravidian populations	Middle-east
James Hornell	Diffusion theory	From Mediterranean to Egypt to India
Tamil scholars - one group	Displaced from Indus valley	Indus valley
Tamil scholars – other group	Many references in the ancient Tamil literature point to the submergence of land masses	Kumarikkandam i.e, Kumari continent

## Various classification of Homo sapiens

Geographical – according to Garn (1961)	Genetical – according to Boyd (1964)	
Amerindian Polynesian Micronesian Melanesian-Papuan Australian Asiatic <u>Indian</u> European African	<u>American group</u> American Indian race <u>Pacific group</u> Indonesian race Melanesian race Polynesian race Australian (aboriginal race) <u>Asian group</u> Asian race <u>Indo-Dravidian race</u>	<u>European group</u> Early Europeans Lapps Northwest Europeans Eastern and Central Europeans Mediterranean <u>African group</u> African race

Further divisions based on local variations noted:

Local – According to Garn (1961)		<u>Local –</u> <u>according to Dobzhansky (1962)</u>	
Northwest European Northeast European Alpine Mediterranean Iranian East African Sudanese Forest Negro Bantu Turkic Tibetan North Chinese ExtremeMongoloid Southeast Asiatic <u>Hindu</u> <u>Dravidian</u>	North American Central American South American Fuegian Lapp Pacific “Negrito” African Pygmy Eskimo Ainu Murrayian Australian Capenterian Australian Bushman and Hottentot North American coloured South African coloured Ladino Neo-Hawaiian	Northwest European Northeast European Alpine Mediterranean <u>Hindu</u> Turkic Tibetan North Chinese Classic Mongoloid Eskimo Southeast Asiatic Ainu Lapp North American Indian Central American Indian South American Indian Sudanese	Forest Negro Bantu Bushman and Hottentot African Pigmy <u>Dravidian</u> Negrito Melanesian-Papuan Murrayian Carpenterian Micrinesian Polynesian Neo-Hawaiian Ladino North American coloured South American coloured

Note the classification of “races of India” under different categories.